THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.SUDERSHAN REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION No. 3959 OF 2000

Dated: 1st September, 2005.

Between

R.Venkatesh -- Petitioner

And

The Managing Director, Hyderabad

Metro Water Supply & Sewerage Board,

Hyderabad and others.

-- Respondents.

ORAL ORDER:

The respondent-Board, admittedly, awarded the work of manufacturing, supply, laying, jointing, testing and commissioning of 1200 mm diameter M.S. outlet work from Bhojagutta reservoir for connecting the main at Mehidipatnam crossroads, to M/s Bhooratnam & Company and not to the petitioner. The petitioner appears to have obtained sub-contract from the said company, with which the respondent-Board has no concern. There is no material available on record to suggest that the authorities of the Board themselves have instructed the petitioner to undertake the said work.

That it is under those circumstances, the respondent-Board having made an enquiry passed a detailed order dated: 10.2.2000 rejecting the request of the petitioner for payment of money for the alleged work done. There is a categorical finding

recorded, as is evident from the proceedings dated: 10.2.2000, that the officials of the Board never entrusted the work in question to the petitioner. Yet, the petitioner went on making demands for payment of money. It is under those circumstances, the Board came to the conclusion that the petitioner should be debarred from doing or undertaking any work with the Board.

The petitioner challenged the same in this writ petition and this court by its order dated: 28.4.2000 directed the respondent to consider the representation made by the petitioner dated: 26.2.2000 and pass a speaking order after giving an opportunity to the petitioner. That in compliance of the directions issued by this Court, the respondent Board having considered the representation dated: 26.2.2000, passed the speaking order, a copy of which is made available for perusal of this court. That order remains unchallenged.

Viewed from any angle, I find no grounds in this writ petition requiring any interference. The writ petition shall accordingly stand dismissed. However, it is open to the petitioner to challenge the order dated: 26.6.2000, if he is so advised, in which event, the matter can be considered on its own merits. No costs.

2005. (B.SUDERSHAN REDDY, J.)

VR.